

The programme is linked to Outcome 4: Decent employment through inclusive economic growth. In view of the fact that a substantial amount of public money is spent supporting enterprises through EMIA, an evaluation is needed to assess how these resources are utilised. Although **the dti** undertakes periodic monitoring of this programme, an in-depth and broader evaluation is needed to assess its effectiveness in supporting South African manufacturers and exporters.

2. Purpose of the Evaluation

This evaluation will provide: (1) Strategic information by determining if EMIA is achieving its objectives and (2) Operational information by examining where, how and why its implementation achieves/ does not achieve the best results). Lessons from the evaluation will be used to improve programme performance.

3. Key Evaluation Questions

- 3.1 To what extent are the objectives of this programme being achieved?
- 3.2 What is the reach/penetration, accessibility and spread of the programme across sectors and targeted groups (women-owned, black-owned, youth, SMMEs, regions)?
- 3.3 What are the challenges of benefiting enterprises in terms of sustaining or growing their markets? How can these challenges be addressed?
- 3.4 What are the implications of the current administrative arrangements on the programme performance?
- 3.5 What are the costs in relation to the benefits of the programme?
- 3.6 What are the operational constraints and challenges of implementing EMIA and how can the programme be improved?

4. Intended Users and Stakeholders of the Evaluation

The main user of the evaluation results will be **the dti**. In addition, departments within the economic cluster such as the National Treasury and the Department of Economic Development will have interest in the evaluation results.

5. Scope of the Evaluation

5.1 Time period under review

The evaluation will cover the time period from 2009/10 up to 31 March 2013.

5.2 EMIA Offerings (sub-schemes)

All offerings (except CPF)

5.3 Geographic coverage

Five (5) representative provinces have been **selected** to form the sample for the evaluation, namely Gauteng, Western Cape, Northern Cape, Free State and Mpumalanga. The selection is based on programme performance information from **the dti** monitoring reports for the 2012/13 financial year, which indicates that enterprises in Gauteng and Western Cape have the highest percentage of approvals, approximately 48% and 28%, respectively as displayed in **Table 1** below. Northern Cape and Free State were selected based on the least percentage of approvals (both achieving 1% respectively) whereas Mpumalanga was selected because it achieved 4%, a score falling within the medium band.

Table 1: EMIA approvals across provinces (2012/13 Financial Year)

| PROVINCE | IDAD | TISA | TOTAL | % |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|
| Eastern Cape | 26 | 56 | 82 | 4 |
| Free State | 5 | 21 | 26 | 1 |
| Gauteng | 488 | 593 | 1081 | 48 |
| KwaZulu -Natal | 67 | 138 | 205 | 9 |
| Limpopo | 6 | 37 | 43 | 2 |
| Mpumalanga | 40 | 59 | 99 | 4 |
| Northern Cape | 0 | 15 | 15 | 1 |
| North West | 13 | 35 | 48 | 2 |
| Western Cape | 373 | 259 | 632 | 28 |
| Total | 1018 | 1213 | 2231 | 100 |

5.4 Beneficiary Groups targeted for evaluation

South African exporters disaggregated according to the following indicators: gender, race, enterprise size, sector, youth and people with disability (disabled).

6. Products/Deliverables

The service provider is expected to deliver the following products:

- **Inception Report** as a follow-up to the proposal with a revised evaluation plan, overall evaluation design and detailed methodology and content structure for the final report. This forms the basis for judging performance;
- **Literature review** (including an International Comparative review of similar incentives between South Africa and at least 2 other countries);
- The service provider will need to develop the theory of change and review the intervention logic of the EMIA;
- **Final data collection instruments** and other tools;
- **Analysis plan**;
- **Field work report**;
- **Draft Evaluation Report** for review, full and in 1/3/25 format, with findings and recommendations. The report should be submitted to the contact person of the DPME.
- A **workshop with stakeholders** to discuss the draft report;
- The **final evaluation report**, both full and in 1/3/25 format, in hard copy and electronic;
- **Provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation** (including interviews) when data is collected.
- **A Power-point or audio-visual presentation of the results.**

7. Methodology/evaluation approach

A multi-method approach will be used to evaluate the evaluation of EMIA. This will include the following methods:

7.1 Systematic Review

Collect data on project records, profiling data and monitoring reports across all **nine provinces**. Conduct a systematic review, draw conclusions and formulate recommendations.

7.2 Literature Review

- 1) Conduct **document reviews** on the export sector in South Africa.
- 2) Do an **International Comparative Study**, comparing South Africa with **two** other countries implementing similar incentive programmes. One successful country from the European Union and South Korea.
- 3) Analyse evidence from the literature reviews, draw conclusions and formulate recommendations.

7.3 Site visits, observations and Interviews

- 1) Collect data (amongst others, on export turn over, job creation, attracting FDI, emerging exporters and satisfaction with EMIA offerings and administration) in targeted enterprises in 5 selected provinces. This will include visiting the enterprise owners at their business premises and conducting face to face interviews and Focus group sessions with incentive administrators and other EMIA stakeholders.
- 2) Analyse data on the findings of the evaluation, draw conclusions and formulate recommendations.

7.4 Review the design of the EMIA

- Develop the theory of change and review intervention logic of the EMIA.
- In addition, the service provider will need to suggest what revisions to the logic model (outcomes and outputs) are needed, and a rating of progress towards outputs, bottlenecks that hinder the achievement of outputs, reasons underpinning EMIA performance and information for potential replication of lessons for successful projects.
- If there is a need for redesign, recommend how the programme could be redesigned.

8. Milestones

The duration of the evaluation will be 6 months. The evaluation process will commence with an inception meeting scheduled for **8 July 2013** and should be completed by **6 December 2013**. The service provider should produce the project plan indicating the milestones against the deliverables in **table 2** below.

Table 2: Outline project plan and payment schedule

| Deliverable | Delivery Date | % payment |
|--|---------------|-----------|
| Approved Inception Report | 23/07/2013 | 10% |
| Service Provider contract signed | 26/07/2013 | |
| Literature review including comparative reviews (International) | 16/08/2013 | 20% |
| Final data collection instruments and other tools | 06/09/ 2013 | 10% |
| Analysis plan | 06/09/2013 | |
| Field work report | 07/10/ 2013 | |
| Draft Evaluation Report for review. | 30/10/2013 | 20% |
| A workshop with stakeholders to discuss the draft report | 06/11/2013 | |
| Submission of the Final Draft Report full and in 1/3/25 format | 22/11/2013 | |
| Approved final evaluation report (approved by Steering Committee) | 29/11/2013 | 30% |
| Power-point or audio-visual presentation of the results and provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation (including interview transcripts). | 06/12/ 2013 | 10% |

9. Competencies and Skills-set

The following Table of generic competencies is required of the service provider:

| Domain/descriptor | Demonstrated ability to |
|--|---|
| 1 Overarching considerations | |
| 1.1 Contextual knowledge and understanding | <p>Have knowledge of relevant sectors and government systems in relation to outcome 4 “decent employment through inclusive economic growth”, especially the export sector.</p> <p>Experience in International Trade and operations (FDIs, Exports and Imports),</p> <p>Appropriately relate the evaluation to current political, policy and governance environments.</p> <p>Perform appropriately in cross-cultural roles with cultural sensitivity and attends appropriately to issues of diversity</p> |
| 1.2 Ethical conduct | Understand ethical issues relating to evaluation, including potential or actual conflict of interest, protecting confidentiality/anonymity, and obtaining informed consent from evaluation participants. |
| 1.3 Interpersonal skills | Lead an evaluation and its processes using facilitation and learning approaches, to promote commitment and ownership of stakeholders |
| 2 Evaluation leadership | Lead and manage an evaluation team effectively |
| 3 Evaluation craft | |
| 3.1 Evaluative discipline and practice | Use knowledge base of evaluation (theories, models including logic and theory based models, types, methods and tools), critical thinking, analytical and synthesis skills relevant to the evaluation and benchmarking. |
| 3.2 Research practice | <p>Design specific research methods and tools that address the evaluation’s research needs. This may include qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods.</p> <p>Systematically gather, analyse, and synthesise relevant evidence, data and information from a range of sources, identifying relevant material, assessing its quality, spotting gaps</p> |
| 4 Implementation of evaluation | |
| 4.1 Evaluation planning | |
| Theory of change | Develop clear theory of change with quality programme logframes with good programme logic and indicators |
| Design | Design and cost an appropriate and feasible evaluation with appropriate questions and methods, based on the evaluation’s purpose and objectives. |
| 4.2 Managing evaluation | Manage evaluation resources to deliver high quality evaluations and related objectives on time and to appropriate standards |
| 4.3 Report writing and communication | Write clear, concise and focused reports that are credible, useful and actionable, address the key evaluation questions, and show the evidence, analysis, synthesis, recommendations and evaluative interpretation and how these build from each other |

Furthermore, it is important that service providers nominated exhibit the following skills and attributes:

- Team players and analytical and lateral thinkers;
- Have excellent communication skills with the ability to listen and learn;
- Have good facilitation skills for strategic thinking, problem solving, and stakeholder management in complex situations;
- Have the ability to work under consistent and continuous pressure from varied sources, yet be able to maintain a supportive approach; and
- Have excellent computing skills including detailed knowledge and use of: Word, Excel, Power Point, Microsoft Project or similar compatible software.

10. Evaluation Team

The service provider should specify the number of evaluators expected to be part of the team, their areas of expertise and their respective responsibilities. The service provider also needs to demonstrate how and when it will ensure skills transfer to those DPME and **the dti** staff that will participate in the evaluation process.

The team must include **experts with proven experience and expertise** in the export sector. The team must possess relevant qualification(s), including at least a Master's Degree.

11. Management Arrangements

11.1 Role of steering committee

A Steering Committee has been established comprising **the dti**, DPME and other key stakeholders, which will be responsible for overseeing the whole evaluation including approving the inception report and other main deliverables.

11.2 Peer Reviewers

Peer reviewers will be contracted to support the assignment.

11.3 Reporting Arrangements

The evaluation project manager to whom the service provider will report on evaluation process and commissioning, is Mr Jabu Mathe, Director: Evaluation, DPME, but in terms of content issues the contact persons will be Mr Donald Mabusela and Mr Ernest Moagi, Directors for EMIA at **the dti**.

12. Structure and Contents of Proposal to be submitted

12.1 Structure and contents of proposal

A structure and contents of a proposal required from the service provider is shown in **Box 2** below.

Box 2. Structure of a proposal

The tenderer must provide the following details. Failure to provide this will lead to disqualification.

- 1 Understanding of the intervention and the TORs
- 2 Approach, design and methodology for the evaluation (eg literature and documentation review, data collection, tools, sample, suggestions for elaboration or changes to scope and methodology as outlined in the TORs, examples of evaluation questions suggested, process elements)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 3 | Activity-based evaluation plan (including effort for different researchers per activity and time frame linked to activities) |
| 4 | Activity-based budget (in South African Rand, including VAT) |
| 5 | Competence (include list of related projects undertaken of main contractor and subcontractors, making clear who did what, and contact people for references) |
| 6 | Team (team members, roles and level of effort) |
| 7 | Capacity development elements (building capacity of partner departments and PDI/young evaluators) |
| 8 | Quality assurance plan (to ensure that the process and products are of good quality) |

Attachments

Example of a related evaluation report undertaken

CVs of key personnel

Completed supply chain forms attached herewith (including updated tax clearance)

13. Information for service providers

The service provider should provide a proposal following the structure above. In addition short-listed candidates will be asked to come and present their proposals on 25 June 2013 as part of the selection process. Tenders should be submitted by 16.00 on 18 June 2013 with electronic and 6 hard copies.

13.1 Key background documents

A list of key documents will be provided at the bidders briefing meeting.

13.2 Evaluation criteria for proposals

This refers to the criteria for assessing the received proposals and the scores attached to each criterion. There are standard government procurement processes. Two main criteria are functionality/capability and price. Functionality/capability factors must cover the competences outlined in **section 8** as demonstrated through:

- Quality of proposal;
- Service provider's relevant previous experience including of any subcontractors;
- Qualifications and expertise of the proposed evaluation team members.

13.3 Pricing requirements

All prices must be inclusive of VAT. Price escalations and the conditions of escalation should be clearly indicated. No variation of contract price or scope creep will be permitted. Price proposals should be fully inclusive to deliver the outputs indicated in these terms of reference.

13.4 Evaluation of proposals**13.4.1 Administrative compliance**

Only proposals and quotations that comply with all administrative requirements will be considered acceptable for further evaluation. Incomplete and late bids / quotes will not be considered. The following documentation must be submitted for each quote/bid:

- Documents specified in the tender documents (distributed separately from this ToR)
- Any other requirement specified in the ToR

13.4.2 Functional Evaluation

Only bids/quotes that comply with all administrative requirements (acceptable bids) will be considered during the functional evaluation phase. All bids/quotes will be scored as follows against the function criteria indicated below:

- 1 – Does not comply with the requirements
- 2 – Partial compliance with requirements
- 3 – Full compliance with requirements
- 4 – Exceeds requirements

Table 3 below outlines the functional evaluation criteria as applied to the competences outlined in section 8 which will be used in assessing the proposals.

Table 3: Functional evaluation criteria

| Domain Descriptor | Functional Evaluation Criteria | Weight | Score | Weight X Score | Minimum |
|---|---|--------|-------|----------------|---------|
| Quality of the Proposal | Understanding of the Working of Government in general and the Outcomes Approach in particular. | 4 | | | 8 |
| | Approach, design and methodology for evaluation | 4 | | | 8 |
| | Quality of activity-based plan (including effort for different consultants per activity and time frame linked to activities) | 4 | | | 8 |
| | Demonstrated high quality experience in at least 5 related projects undertaken in last 5 years by main contractor and subcontractors | 4 | | | 8 |
| | Knowledge and exposure to International good practise, particularly in middle-income and African Countries. | 1 | | | 2 |
| | Capacity development element (building capacity of partners, especially young evaluators and PDIs) | 1 | | | 2 |
| | Team demonstrate the following key competences related to this assignment: | | | | |
| 1. Overarching Considerations | | | | | |
| 1.1. Contextual Knowledge and understanding | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the export sector and government systems in relation to the evaluation and can appropriately relate the evaluation to the current political, policy and governance environments. • Experience in International Trade and operations (FDIs, Exports and Imports), | 3 | | | 6 |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|----|--|--|-----|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perform appropriately in cross-cultural roles with cultural sensitivity and attends appropriately to diversity issues | 2 | | | 4 |
| 1.2 Ethical Conduct | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand ethical issues relating evaluation, including potential or actual conflict of interest, protecting confidentiality/anonymity, and obtaining informed consent from evaluation participants. | 2 | | | 4 |
| 2. Evaluation Leadership | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lead an evaluation team effectively to project completion, using facilitation to promote commitment and ownership of evaluation. | 5 | | | 10 |
| 3. Evaluation Craft | | | | | |
| 3.1 Evaluative discipline | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use knowledge base of evaluations of evaluation (theories, models including logic and theory based models, types, methods and tools) critical thinking, analytical and synthesis skills relevant to the evaluation. | 3 | | | 6 |
| 3.2 Research Practice | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to systematically gather, analyse, and synthesise relevant evidence, data and information from a range of sources, identifying relevant material, assessing its quality, spotting gaps. | 3 | | | 6 |
| 4. Implementation of Evaluation | | | | | |
| 4.1 Evaluation Planning Theory of Change | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to develop clear theory of change with quality programme logframes with good programme logic and indicators | 3 | | | 6 |
| 4.2 Managing Evaluation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to manage evaluation resources to deliver high quality evaluations and related objectives on time and to appropriate standards | 5 | | | 10 |
| 4.3 Report writing and communication | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to write clear, concise and focused reports that are credible, useful and actionable and address the key evaluation questions | 5 | | | 10 |
| Total | | 50 | | | 100 |

Minimum requirement: Service providers that submitted acceptable bids and that scored at least the minimum for each element as well as the overall minimum score (75), based on the average of scores awarded by the evaluation panel members.

Proposals should clearly address the project description and the functional evaluation criteria mentioned above.

13.4.3 Price evaluation: The PPPFA

Only bids/quotes that meet the minimum required indicated under functional evaluation above will be evaluated in terms of the Preferential Procurement Framework Act and related regulations. The 90/10 evaluation method will be used for bids from R1 million and the 80/20 method will be used for bids/quotes below R1 million. Points will be awarded to a bidder for attaining the B-BBEE status level of contribution in accordance with the table contained in SBD 6.1 (see attached bid documents) In the application of the 80/20 preference point system, if all bids received exceed R1 000 000, the bid will be cancelled. If one or more of the acceptable bid(s) received are within the R1 000 000 threshold, all bids received will be evaluated on the 80/20 preference point system.

In the application of the 90/10 preference point system, if all bids received are equal to or below R1 000 000, the bid will be cancelled. If one or more of the acceptable bid(s) received are above the R1 000 000 threshold, all bids received will be evaluated on the 90/10 preference point system.

In this bid, the 80/20 preference point system will apply.

14. General and special conditions of contract

Awarding of the final contract will be subject to the conclusion of a service level agreement between the Department and the successful service provider.

15. Intellectual property

DPME and **the dti** will own copyright of the products of this assignment, except prior material brought in to the assignment or that owned by a third party. The service provider will not use the material (whether in part or whole) without the written permission of DPME and **the dti**.

16. Enquiries

Regarding the evaluation process and commissioning, please contact Mr Jabu Mathe, Director: Evaluation, DPME: Tel. 012 308 1466 / Cell: 073 476 3503, E-mail: jabu@po-dpme.gov.za but in terms of content issues, please contact Mr Donald Mabusela at Tel: 012 3941716 / Cell: 0833794690 / Email: DMabusela@thedti.gov.za or Mr Ernest Moagi at Tel: 0123941961/Cell: 0824965331/ [Email: EMoagi@thedti.gov.za](mailto:EMoagi@thedti.gov.za) (both Directors for EMIA at **the dti**).